

The Anti-Slavery Bogle.

MARIUS R. ROBINSON, EDITOR.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

ANN PEARSON, PUBLISHING AGENT.

VOL. 12.—NO. 3.

SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 30, 1856.

WHOLE NO. 569.

The Anti-Slavery Bogle.

SPURIOUS REPUBLICANISM.

The champions of the Republican party vehemently protest that it is not an abolition party, and they seem very anxious lest the public should fail to note this discrimination. The following incident, reported to us by a Philadelphia correspondent, affords unmistakable evidence that, in one locality at least, Republicanism, as popularly understood, is something very different from Abolitionism. But such Republicanism is a gross imposture. Our correspondent says:

"About two weeks since, a grand ratification meeting was held in the City of Camden, N. J., in favor of 'Freedom and Freedom.' A practical joker in that town (it is said) belongs to the Democratic party; thought he would test the sincerity of these modern Republicans. Accordingly, he had bills posted about the street, inviting the colored people of Camden to attend the 'Freedom and Freedom' meeting, to be held in the Court-house. A number of colored men and women, who doubtless felt a personal interest in the movement of this kind, assembled at an early hour and obtained seats in the gallery of the building. But they did not remain long in peace. The alarm soon spread among the friends of 'Freedom and Freedom' that there were 'niggers' in the Court-house. As there is nothing said in their platform about freedom for the black man, they did not think it necessary to respect his feelings or his rights, consequently they hastened to prevent the introduction of any person whose presence would be obnoxious to the spirit and intent of the meeting, and as soon as practicable, with the cooperation of the Marshal of the city, removed from the sacred edifice, wherein justice is supposed to reign triumphant, those colored men and women who had been so fortunate (?) as to gain an entrance. Comment on this is scarcely needed. And yet we have it forcibly given in the fact that, during a discussion held at the Republican Headquarters in this city, a Democratic speaker charged this indecency home upon them, and not a man among them could meet it with a denial, or in any other way than to retort by asserting that the Marshal who aided them in the dirty business was a member of the Democratic party."—A. S. Standard.

THE PRESIDENT WITH HIS BLOODY HANDS.

In the debate upon Toombs' Kansas bill, in the Senate, July 21, Mr. Wilson of Massachusetts thus alluded to the President and his relations to the Democratic party. The passage deserves to be placed on record as an example of the sort of plain speaking which has won for Mr. Wilson the admiration of his constituents.

"I am opposed to this bill for another reason. I will not trust the President of the United States in anything relating to Kansas. He has shown no evidence that he ought to be trusted by the friends of free Kansas. The Senator from Georgia has passed a eulogium on him to-night. He has told us how he was taken up early by his native State, and how he was sustained and supported; but he did not tell us how the Democratic party, in its late National Convention, rewarded him for all his fidelity to slavery. Sir, you can cover your victim with garlands now. He has performed your work. He asked you to sustain him by renominating him at your Cincinnati Convention with the blood of the murdered people of Kansas dripping from his hands—with the blood of the murdered and burning dwellings of Kansas flashing upon his brow. There he stood before you, your willing agent—your obedient tool. You averted your eyes from him—you served him as you had served other and better men. You flung him away like a worthless thing. Sir, I do not want that erstwhile man to have any more power to control the future of Kansas. He gave to Kansas, Shannon, Woodson, LeCompte, Cato, Davidson, Calhoun, and their confederates—the vile tools of tyranny—the fit associates of border ruffians. Of his appointees in that Territory, one only has been true to freedom; the others have been the agents for persecuting the Free State men, and making Kansas a slaveholding State. His influence has been a curse to Kansas, and he has given to slavery his powerful arm. He did not do so. So shameless has been his conduct, that you dare not re-nominate him.

"I will not trust that man who has flung aside by renominating him at your Cincinnati Convention, and who are not legal voters. I vote for no bill that puts power in his hands red with the blood of the murdered people of Kansas."

WHITE SLAVES.

What security have the German and Irish that their children will not, within a hundred years, be reduced to slavery in this land of their adoption? How do they know that such sheets as the *Enquirer* has thrown against their prosperity, just as blood in his veins? On last Monday a mother and a boy, bound with long travel, after a brief rest crossed the river from the land of slavery, *en route* for Canada. The bloodhounds were after them; and if they had been caught by the editor of the *Enquirer*, they would have been sent back to slavery. The boy had already three times been, to slavery; yet the boy was fairer than H. H. Robinson ever was. His mild, bright eyes were full of intelligence, his head was finely shaped, and the curling ringlets of auburn hair that clustered about his brow were extremely beautiful. The mother was a woman somewhat darker than her son, of uncommon intelligence and energy. She was a Christian mother flying with her white child from the demon of her race, and manacle poor whites, if they had the power.—*Cincinnati Freeman*.

The *Opelousas Courier* contains the following—a sample of the common advertisement of the kind in the Southern press—setting forth the ability of bloodhounds to catch skillful mechanics and laborers when they run away from their democratic masters:

"Ho! for the RUNAWAYS.—The undersigned informs the public, and his friends of this and neighboring parishes, that having purchased a pack of excellent hounds for runaway slaves, he is now ready to answer any call that may be made to him one mile south of Opelousas, or at the office of the *Courier*, in Opelousas.

"His charges will be \$25 for catching a runaway or \$5 per day for hunting, from the day he leaves his house. In case that he should hunt the runaway during five or six days, the charge will yet be \$25; and if the runaway should come back to his quarters after the dogs are out after him, he will claim the \$25, being the natural consequence and result of the hunt."

—M. HENRY HUSBAND.

It will be observed that M. Henry Husband, Esq., in advertising, turns the office of the *Opelousas Courier* into a Post-restaurant, where we think about the most appropriate use a Southern "Democratic" newspaper office can be put to. For if the paper advertise the bloodhounds and uphold slavery, it should not stop there, but ought to receive orders also for the employment of blood-

hounds. Slavery has accustomed this Republic to buy and sell, but still there is some humanity in the fact of a newspaper office—the temple of liberty—receiving commission for the employment of bloodhounds to catch the affrighted fugitive in the exercise of his inalienable right to "liberty and the pursuit of happiness."—*Tribune*.

BARON VON HUMBOLDT ON SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES AND IN CUBA.

Baron von Humboldt has caused the following article to be inserted in the *Spanische Zeitung*. "Under the title of *Essai Politique sur l'Isle de Cuba*, published in Paris in 1826, I collected together all that the large edition of my *Voyage aux Regions Equinoxiales du Nouveau Continent* contained upon the state of agriculture and slavery in the Antilles. There appeared at the same time an English and a Spanish translation of this work, the latter entitled *Ensayo Político sobre la Isla de Cuba*, neither of which omitted any of the frank and open remarks which my feelings humanity had inspired. But there appears just now, strangely enough, translated from the Spanish translation, and not from the French original, and published by Derby and Jackson, in New York, an octavo volume of 400 pages under the title of *The Island of Cuba*, by Alexander Humboldt, with notes and a preliminary essay by J. S. Thrasher. The translator, who has lived a long time on that beautiful island, has enriched my work by more recent data on the subject of the numerical standing of the population, of the cultivation of the soil, and the state of trade, and generally speaking, exhibited a charitable moderation in his discussion of contemporary life, and the impending dangers which the island of Cuba is now running. It was in 1825, publicly to complain that in a work which bears my name the entire seventh chapter of the Spanish translation, with which my *essai politique* ended, has been arbitrarily omitted. To this very portion of my work I attach greater importance than to any other, and I regret that the translator, of magnetic intensity, or statistical statements, 'I have examined with frankness (I here repeat the words I used thirty years ago) whatever concerns the organization of human society in the colonies the unequal distribution of the rights and the system of life, and the impending dangers which the wisdom of legislators and the moderation of freedom can avert, whatever may be the form of government.

"It is the duty of the traveler who has been an eye-witness of all that tortures and degrades humanity to reach those whose duty it is to relieve them. I have repeated in this treatise the fact that the ancient legislation of Spain on the subject of slavery is less inhuman and atrocious than that of the slave States on the American Continent. North or South of the Equator."

"A steady advocate as I am for the most unfettered expression of opinion in speech or in writing I should never have thought of complaining if I had been attacked on account of my statements; but I do think I am entitled to demand that should all be well to read what has been permitted to circulate from the first year of its appearance in a Spanish translation.

"ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT."
—BERLIN, July, 1855.

COLORED PEOPLE IN OHIO.

Frederick Douglass describing a recent tour in Ohio says:

"We were much pleased with the general aspect of things in most of the localities which we visited. Though the colored people of Ohio are the subjects of many cruel and unjust laws, we found them more solicitous about the development of their manhood, than of their ability to endure, with patience and resignation, the hardships imposed upon them. We saw but little of the cringing Uncle Tom among them. They seem anxious to get around the corner of the law, and it is easier to hard the rooted maintain from their respect, than to force the yoke of slavery upon a people determined to be free." And they demonstrate their consciousness of means to be employed for their complete enfranchisement. Education, wealth, elevated aspirations, indomitable energy, and perseverance—these are the qualities which must constitute the colored man's elevation here, or he never will be elevated. This seems to be well understood by the colored people of Ohio, and they are accordingly governed by this philosophy. One very noticeable feature, which strikes an Eastern man who visits them, is the large number of wealthy farmers among them; men who own their three, four, and five hundred acres of land. In Pee Pee Settlement, Pike Co., there is a large number of colored persons, most of whom have emigrated from Virginia. They have realized Horace Greeley's idea of settling a township. They control over seven thousand acres of land, and are intelligent, energetic, and wealth, are undeniably far in advance of their white neighbors. There are also among them the representatives of the various branches of mechanics, usually found in country communities. But while they are in a decided majority in the township, they are excluded from the polls, and have no voice whatever in the levying, collection, or distribution of taxes. We sincerely trust that this great outrage will not only be considered, but immediate measures be taken to redress the wrong.

At Red Oak Settlement, a few miles from Ripley (where we had excellent meetings), there is also a large number of wealthy colored farmers and mechanics, who are a credit to the community. The *Ames* family, formerly of South Carolina, are a fine specimen of the colored man, and have become quite wealthy, and are much respected by their white neighbors, who think it no condescension to mingle with them in any circle. We have never met with a more interesting family, or one which was, in a practical manner, doing more for the elevation of those with whom they are identified in interest and position. The old gentleman is a noble specimen of humanity. He bought himself at the age of forty-two, then left Carolina, and commenced life for himself; to-day he is worth from twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars, and is taking the care of himself and a large family who love and honor him.

"Gerrit Smith has just pledged himself to give \$1,500 for the next year to be used in establishing freedom in Kansas. He gave but a short time since, at the Kansas relief meeting in Albany, \$2,000. Prior to this he had sent about \$1,000 to the Boston Emigrant Committee. Out of his funds he subsequently equipped a Madison County company of one hundred picked men, and paid their expenses to the distant Territory. At Syracuse he made a votive offering on the altar of Liberty of \$10,000. When the generous subscription made yesterday at Buffalo, shall be complete, this 'Champion of Freedom' will have given at least \$40,000 to make a Republican State out of the slavery-coveted Kansas."

Each State, it must be remembered, sends two members to the Senate. The largest and the smallest have the same representation in the Senate, while the members of the other Houses nearly correspond in number with the population. As the Northern States abolished slavery, one after another, the South became alarmed lest the slave States should fall into a minority in the Senate, as it was too clear that they must in the other

A RETROSPECT.

The following article originally appeared in the *Daily News* a short time since. It is the best sketch of the History of American Compromise that we have seen, we cannot do better than present it to our readers. It is from the pen of Mrs. Harriet Martineau, whose acquaintance with American politics is unequalled by any other eminent writer in Europe.

The present sketch has created so much interest, that the author has republished it at greater length in pamphlet form, from a conviction in which we entirely sympathize, of the importance of diffusing in England correct information respecting the conduct and character of the Abolitionists and the wisdom of their measure will be appreciated as they deserve.

We think it right in this place to say, that amongst all the English names of equal eminence there is none so highly respected by the American Abolitionists as that of Miss H. Martineau, from whom, ever since her acquaintance with them commenced in the United States, under circumstances of peculiar trial, about twenty-eight years ago, they have continued to receive the warm sympathy and assistance in their arduous labor.

AN HISTORICAL RETROSPECT OF THE AMERICAN COMPROMISES.

AMERICA THE COUNTRY OF TWO IDEAS.

The existing condition of affairs in the United States naturally presents to the mind of every one another about the meaning of the prominent terms of the great domestic controversy; and there are few who can give a precise answer. "What is the Missouri Compromise?" "What is the Nebraska Bill?" "Why is the settlement of Kansas so critical?" These are the questions which are asked of our readers by some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the historical antecedents of the controversy, which has now assumed the character of a civil war, may supply a want, and no disgrace, of our readers having some idea, but which require an accurate answer before the interior politics of the American Union can be so clearly understood as they ought to be by every Englishman. A brief statement of the

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

ing of the next slave power had its policy ready. On the plea that the new territories obtained from Mexico were left free to decide for themselves about slavery, Mr. Douglas (encouraged as there is reason to believe, by the late Carr, who hoped to profit by disorder in the republic) proposed that Kansas and Nebraska should also be free to have slave institutions or not; that the compromise of 1850 should be regarded as final and conclusive, and that the Missouri compromise should be repealed. The thing was done, and the vast territory to the north-west of the existing Union is thrown open for the extension of slavery. The mode of the transaction was as disgraceful as its object.

The result is so recent that we need only indicate the order of the occurrences. Kansas, the territory lying immediately west of Missouri, was the first object of the slave power. Every effort was made to pour in slaveholders and slaves, to get possession first, but the Slave States are poor, thinly-peopled, and unskilled in organization, while the Northern States are full of wealth, and can send any amount of free settlers, both from their own population and from the immigrant supply which is for ever flowing in. To battle the free settlers, who would have framed their institutions in an orderly and constitutional way, in pursuance of laws from the federal government, an armed banditti from Missouri crossed the frontier, voted without any qualification of residence, and finally undermined a house where the votes were taken, seized the ballot-boxes, put the free settlers to flight, removed the governor and appointed another, and murdered several of the citizens. The President, who had appointed the first instance, sanctioned their appointment, sent United States troops and ammunition to them, and obstructed to the utmost of his power the appointment of a congressional commission of inquiry. That commission has sat, under threats of violence, and the first part of the evidence has been brought safely to Washington; but the capital, Lawrence, is burnt, more murders have been committed, and civil war seems to be fairly begun. We have related from time to time the proceedings in the Northern and Southern States, in support of the Free Settlers on the one hand and the Border Ruffians on the other. We need only add that as, according to the last census, the slaveholding population of the whole country is under 32 per cent of the white population it is clear that the republic can make freedom national and slavery only sectional, whenever it pleases so to do. The time seems to have come for a decision. The decision ought to have been made long ago; but it cannot now be deferred. The passions of the South have been growing vehement since the election of Mr. Brooks as Speaker of the Representatives of Washington. The course that will be taken about Mr. Brooks' expulsion from Congress for his assault on Mr. Sumner will indicate much. The spirit of the North is roused. If it does not relapse into apathy, or fear or sordid interest, it will decide the controversy which so vexed the soul of Washington and his comrades. What the solution will be, whether a submission on the part of the South to a complete remodelling of the policy of the republic, or whether the republic will break up in its elements, and be succeeded by a new one, the Northern being in sympathy with all other free countries, while the Southern lapses into barbarism, and pursues a "manifest destiny" of buccannery aggression; or whether any new combination, yet undreamed of, shall arise, we will not undertake to prophesy. The one certain point in the case is that the crisis is come. Mr. Everett thinks that the gold of California would be well spent in purchasing oblivion of a single week of the week which saw Lawrence burnt beyond the Mississippi and Mr. Sumner struck down in the Senate at Washington. But happily, such oblivion is not possible. Congress has been tried; and, one after another, have been tried away. Something must be done to obtain a settlement, and to preserve the republic; and that something will not be a compromise.

We have endeavored to furnish an explanation of the terms of the controversy. Henceforth, events are likely to speak very plainly for themselves.

CAROLINA CHIVALRY—BY AN IMPARTIAL WITNESS.

The extravagant pretensions of Senator Butler of South Carolina, in regard to the conduct of the troops and people of his own State during the Revolutionary war, have earned for him the title of "Palmetto chivalry," and he has been aware of the existence of men, and a great number of them, who officers who denounce in terms of unmeasured scorn the "shameful imbecility" of South Carolina. From the letters of General Otho Holland Williams of Maryland, one of the noblest men of the time, the intimate friend and right-hand man of Gen. Nathaniel Greene, many have learned the truth in proof of the chivalry of the State of South Carolina during the War of Independence. One or two will suffice.

Gen. Williams, writing to his brother in Maryland, after the capture of Charleston by Sir Henry Clinton, says: "You may rely on it, my dear brother, that the enemy have had such footing and influence in this country, that their success in putting the Federalists together by the ears has exceeded even their own expectations; the distraction that prevails surpasses anything I ever before witnessed, and equals any idea which your imagination can conceive of a desperate and inveterate civil war. There are a few virtuous and good men in this State, and in the great majority of the people is composed of the most unprincipled, abandoned, and vicious rascals that ever inhabited the earth. The daily deliberate murders committed by pretended Whigs and reputed Tories (men who are actually neither one thing nor the other in principle) are too numerous and too shocking to relate. The licentiousness of various classes and denominations of villains, desolate this country, impoverish all who attempt to live by other means, and destroy the strength and resources of the country, which ought to be collected and united against a common enemy."

Toward the close of the war, when Gen. Williams' health required his return to Baltimore, he thus writes to a brother officer, Maj. Edwards, vindicating Greene from the slanderous charges heaped upon him: "The late revolution in South Carolina is owing not only to a change of circumstances, but to a change of men in the government of that country. How daringly impudent is it for those who have been rescued from misery and dejection, to arraign the virtue that saved them. General Greene exercised a superior judgement, changed the system of military operations in that country and used the only possible means of recovering it—and dare the ingrates now accuse him of any intention of design, or any view of ambition other than that which receives its highest gratification from the thanks and approbation of a free people? And do the devils dare to treat with neglect and contempt that little corps of gallant men who saved them from despair and slavery? Their ingratitude proves manifestly how well they deserved the chains which have been taken off their necks. There are many sensible, amiable characters in Carolina, but I always feared the majority were envious, jealous, malicious, designing unprincipled people. Come, come, enough of all this. Let us leave them. I am glad to hear the Northern troops are returning. Though I cannot flatter myself with the pleasure of seeing them rewarded as they deserve, there will be something done for them; they will not starve on the same fields in which they have bled."

General Williams' original letters, from which these extracts have been made, are now in the possession of his grandson, residing in Baltimore.

The Charleston Mercury says, the famous gag resolutions of Abner were drawn up by R. B. Rhett, of South Carolina, who called a caucus of the Democratic members of Congress, to which they were submitted. After adoption, Mr. Rhett proposed that Mr. Fairfield, who had just been elected Governor of Maine, should offer them. He declined, however, and the dirty work was assigned to Abner, whose name has ever since been a word of loathing and contempt in the North.

POLITICS DIVORCED FROM MORAL PRINCIPLE.

The following extract is taken from a sermon recently preached by Dr. Tyng, (Episcopal), at the right track. "They're all right down there." Mr. Johnson seems to understand exactly where to get the bromide of iodine which is to cure the itching irritation of the country.

"Kindred and consequential to these has been another sin—the entire divorce of the whole system of politics from the fear of God. By a strange confusion of moral sense, obligation to party is made unquestionable and supreme. No matter what may be the character of its agents—no matter what may be the evil principles or iniquitous measures incorporated in its action, how many good men there are whom the single consideration, that it is the action of their own party is enough. They ask no questions, listen to no arguments, recognize no higher authority. How few Christian men ever think of taking counsel of God in questions of public affairs, and giving religious the control of their politics. How few citizens recognize their responsibility to God for their political influence.

SCENE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

During the discussions on the army bill in the House just before its adjournment, Brooks endeavored to get up a little scene.

Mr. Giddings, in behalf of the House members of course, in a clear and bold statement, explained to the House the reasons of his disagreement, indicating its action, urging Representatives to adhere to the pious, and charging the responsibility for the failure of the bill upon the Senate. While thus speaking of Kansas affairs, he said that "attempts had been made to suppress freedom of speech."

Mr. Brooks took this as personal, and rose to demand an explanation. For about five minutes, quite a scene ensued, and it required all the chairmanship even of Speaker Banks to subdue the uproar. Giddings refused to be interrupted, and Bully Brooks was guided by the explanations of his friends who had apprehended more correctly the bearing of Mr. Giddings' remarks, to take his seat. It was rather exciting for a time. Brooks would arise—"Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio has made an allusion which demands explanation; I respectfully insist on an explanation."

Speaker Banks—"The gentleman from South Carolina is plainly not in order."

Brooks—"Mr. Speaker, I ask a respectful question. I venerate gray hairs, but—"

Speaker Banks—"The gentleman is out of order. He will resume his seat."

Giddings—"The gentleman from South Carolina has once given us to understand that he would take notice of such members as I, and I only desire that he would extend the same favor to me now."

COLOR-PHOBIA.

We find the following in a letter written from this city to the New York Tribune. The scene occurred on the Cincinnati and Indianapolis Railroad.—*Cin. Gazette.*

One incident on the road did not excite any pleasure. The Hon. Thomas Corwin got into the ladies' car at Cincinnati, with a company of friends, on his way to Chicago, as I was told. He is still very lame—in fact, almost helpless—from the effects of a fall, or from some other cause, which he has not yet recovered from. I do not think he could walk the length of a car in motion, and being so much an invalid, he had a colored man in attendance upon him. This man was with Mr. Corwin, and was ejected by the conductor from the car, although Mr. Corwin asked that he might be allowed to remain. He was told to wait on the platform, and the man would not go into another car, but he was put out at the next station, and that if he—Mr. C.—felt so strong a desire to be with the man, he might either go into another car, or they might both stop at the next station. I did not see this train, although in the same car, which I relate the facts as the conductor—in all other respects very gentlemanly in his ways—related to me. Another thing I did see. A colored man well dressed—and from his manner and dress I took him to be a clergyman—got in at one of the stations, and he was obliged to show his ticket, which the conductor retained. The whole look of the thing was odious. Excepting these incidental occurrences, I was greatly gratified with my ride on this road. Its management is very superior, and I think it cannot fail to be profitable as an investment.

"SORRY FOR IT."

We fear Mr. Brooks has made an imprudent remark in his closing speech in the House. He says that if Mr. Sumner had wrested the cane from his hand, he might have done what he should have been sorry for all his life; that is to say, he might have killed him, and that he would have been sorry for it. Mr. Brooks' remark is so absurd, and so full of Mr. Brooks' usual constituents. It is not to be wondered at that the mere slaying of an Abolitionist should be a matter of regret to one of the chivalry? Does Mr. Brooks mean to say that he would really have been sorry if he had killed a Massachusetts Senator in the District of Columbia? or the price of nearly doing it is fixed at only \$300? Such manly sensibility is unworthy of gutta serena. Such womanly weakness is discreditable in a representative of South Carolina. We do not think that such a man will be likely to receive Senatorial honors; he will doubtless receive the endorsement of his immediate constituency for his exhibition of chivalry, but we apprehend that he cannot expect advancement after the declaration that, under any circumstances, it would be a matter of regret to him that he had killed a Massachusetts Senator. In taking all the precautions that Mr. Brooks did in consulting with his friends upon the best plan of attack consistently with his personal safety, in arming himself with a deadly weapon, not openly carried, but doubtless as conveniently within reach. If the necessary concealment would permit, he acted up to the true spirit of chivalry of chivalry (South Carolina). But when he intimates that if Mr. Sumner, in spite of all the disadvantage at which he was taken, had wrested the cane from his hand, and he or his accomplices had shot him, that he should have lamented the act he comes quite up to the level of an Abolitionist himself. An explanation of this extraordinary admission will doubtless be looked for in South Carolina.—*Providence Journal.*

A FILLMORE SPEECH.—There was a Fillmore meeting in Cincinnati last week, which was addressed, among others, by Mr. Johnson, a lawyer of that city, who is distinguished for his zeal in behalf of the American candidate, Mr. Johnson said:

"Mr. Fillmore is the only man who can apply ointment to the itching irritation of the country. He asked: 'Where will this disunion black republican party take us?' A voice in the crowd cried, 'they'd take us to h—ll!' 'Yes,' said Mr. J., 'they'd take us to h—ll; and if they'd only take us all to h—ll, I don't care how soon. I for one, am willing to go, (great applause and

laughter) when I get to h—ll, the very first thing I'd do would be to give three cheers for Millard Fillmore.' (Applause and cries of 'you're on the right track.' 'They're all right down there.' Mr. Johnson seems to understand exactly where to get the bromide of iodine which is to cure the itching irritation of the country.)

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

SALEM, OHIO, AUGUST 30, 1856.

NO PAPER NEXT WEEK.—In consequence of the Anniversary and to afford the Printers a little time of relaxation, there will be no paper issued next week. It will make no difference in the number of papers our subscribers will receive. They will get their full volume of fifty two numbers for their subscription money, but will be only a week longer in getting it.

MICHIGAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

We learn from Thomas Chandler that the Michigan Anti-Slavery Society will hold its Third Annual Meeting at Plymouth, Wayne county, Michigan, on Saturday and Sunday, October 4th and 5th. Further particulars will be given hereafter.

THE ANNIVERSARY.

To day the Annual meeting of the Western Anti-Slavery Society, commences in this place. We hope then to see a large assembly of the Friends of the slave from all parts of the Country. The cause of the oppressed white men in Kansas calls for assemblies of earnest sympathizers, by thousands and tens of thousands in State, and shall not the more urgent cry of our millions of perishing slaves be heard. Will not our citizens come at their call to give their sympathy and bestow their aid? We hope for a large gathering. We expect it.

So far as speakers are concerned, there will be unusual inducements for attendance. A recent letter from Mr. Pillsbury places his attendance beyond doubt, if his life and health are spared. Mr. Remond of Massachusetts, one of the most eloquent orators of the country, is expected. Andrew T. Foss, a sturdy champion of Freedom from New Hampshire, will be here; as also, Oliver Johnson, of New York, whom the abolitionists of Ohio know and will rejoice to welcome. Wm. C. Nell, of Massachusetts, a sterling friend of the slave will also be present, besides our friends from this section of the country, among whom we expect Mr. John M. Langton, of Loraine county, an accomplished speaker and an earnest friend of the cause.

The meeting will commence at 10 o'clock on Saturday the 30th inst., at the Friends Meeting House, and will continue during that and the two subsequent days. The meetings on Sunday will probably be held in the grove at the Fair Ground on the Canfield road.

Our friends need not decline coming for fear of lack of accommodations. The citizens of Salem will be found ready to welcome them with a liberal hospitality. There are also two large Temperance Hotels in the place.—The Farquhar House and the Wilson House, while there who prefer it may find comfortable accommodations in private boarding houses, for a reasonable consideration.

BUGLE SUBSCRIPTIONS.—The Anniversary will afford an excellent opportunity to forward money on subscription for the Bugle.

PLEDGES.—All who made pledges to the Society last year, which yet remain unredemmed, are requested to pay them if possible at or before the Anniversary meeting. The Committee need every cent thus pledged in order to square up the business of the current year, which then closes. They have relied upon these pledges to meet their current expenses and a failure to receive them is greatly embarrassing.

A REQUEST.—The Publishing Agent requests all persons who send money on subscription to inform her, if the receipt is not duly acknowledged within a reasonable time after the remittance is made. We sometimes receive letters stating that money has been sent a year or two before and never acknowledged, and complaining sharply that we have not credited them, when the truth is, the money has not been received and we have had no previous knowledge that any has ever been sent. All money received on subscription is acknowledged in the paper as soon as possible after its receipt. By reference to the receipts, subscribers can see how very limited some weeks are our means to meet the current expenses. The weekly expenses of the paper are more than \$40 per week, with the utmost economy.

A SWINDLER.

One day last week Harry Webb, a colored man of Pittsburgh, came to Salem and represented to one of our colored citizens, Frederick Long, a young man of undoubted integrity, that there were at Atwater, six fugitives who were in need of help to get on to Canada, and desired him to make a collection in Salem for their aid. He immediately went to work and collected the sum of \$18.62, a very short time. In the course of the collection, some one suggested that there might be something wrong and in consequence Long refused to pay over the money to Webb, and told him he would go along to Atwater. This he did and found no such persons as reported there—that none had been there. Webb then proposed they should divide the funds and report that the fugitives had been forwarded on. This proposition was declined, and Long returned leaving his companion behind.

The money was collected in small sums and no record kept of the amount received of different individuals, which rendered it impossible to refund to each the amount of his contribution.—At the suggestion therefore, of several of the contributors and the approval of others, he deposited the money with Joel McMillan to be used in aid of future travelers from the South as occasion shall arise; and already one poor refugee, a woman has received aid from the fund. We presume this arrangement will be entirely satisfactory to all the contributors. We make the statement at the request of our young friend who made the collection and who is entitled to much credit for his careful and skillful management of the whole affair.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS, after battling the Republicans with great vigor has in his paper last week, hailed down the Gerrit Smith flag of Abolitionism and declared for Fremont and Dayton. He gives his reasons very elaborately for this course. We do not see however that they are different from the arguments given by others in justifying themselves for confining their labors to the work of limitation of Slavery and its exclusion from Kansas.

DEATH OF MRS. REMOND.

From the Liberator.

DIED.—In Salem, on Friday morning last, August 15th, Mrs. ANA MATILDA, wife of Mr. CHARLES LEXOR REMOND, aged 47 years.

Mrs. R. was a daughter of the late Rev. PETER WILLIAMS, of New York city, and remarkable for her many virtues and excellencies of character. As a daughter, wife, mother, she was all that love and affection could develop in mortal form. As a friend, her attachment was warm and enduring. Her very presence was a benediction; the magnetism of her spirit inspired and controlled all who made her acquaintance; her daily life was equally beautiful and strengthening. We shall ever cherish her memory with admiration and gratitude. At the earliest period of the Anti-Slavery movement, she espoused it with zeal and devotion, and never forgot its claims nor misapprehended the true issue of the hour. Personally identified with an oppressed and proscribed portion of the American people, she soared far above the meanness of an irrational prejudice, and did much for its extirpation by the benignity of her temper, the goodness of her heart, and the loveliness and dignity of her person. Her translation will be deeply lamented by a wide circle as no ordinary loss.

In consequence of this sad event, Mr. Remond will not be able to attend our Anniversary as previously announced. In a recent letter addressed to us he says:—

"I need not assure you of the disappointment I experience in this sad event to fulfil my promise made to you to be present at the approaching Anniversary of the W. A. S. Society and to spend some time with my Sister, Mr. Foss and others in your State, Michigan, Illinois, &c., but duties to my family and especially to the two Orphan boys now with me will detain me for the present."

SERFDOM IN RUSSIA.

A valuable article on this subject will be found on our last page. The writer's statement, that the serfs of Russia are in a worse condition than the slaves of America is disproved by the facts of his own article as compared with the facts of slavery. For instance, petitions of the serfs for a redress of grievances were received, considered, and granted. But such a thing has never been heard of in America, except in the attempted presentation of one petition by John Quincy Adams. Our readers know with what scorn it was received, and how that scorn concentrated itself upon the champion of the right of petition, who dared to present it to the House of Representatives. But Russian Serfdom in its ameliorated form is horrible indeed, and every friend of humanity will rejoice in the prospect of its removal. Our Author thinks that the invasion of Russia by the French and English, taught that Government a beneficial lesson in regard to civilization and the emancipation of her slaves. Not unlikely. And if our American despots can learn this valuable lesson in no other manner, who can object if similar tuition enforce the lesson upon American Democrats.

HISTORY OF THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE.—The article we publish this week from the pen of Miss Martineau is a clear and excellent presentation of facts, which will be perused by our readers with interest and profit. Though thoroughly acquainted with the political history of the question, she contemplates it primarily with the eye and heart of a moral reformer. Some slight inaccuracies occur in regard to minor particulars, but in the main her statements are entirely correct. Miss Martineau gives Ohio altogether too much credit, when she says she has a personal liberty bill which places her virtually outside the pale of the Union. Ohio to her disgrace, gives no personal protection to the liberties of her citizens at all incompatible with the rendition of slaves according to the federal compact. In this she is loyal to the Union, though false to liberty.

BLOODY.—The Leavenworth Journal raises the war cry against the Kansas Free State men, and is for extermination. It says: "Let us be up and be doing—let no quarter be given, but UP TO THE EXTIRPATION OF THE MISCREANTS, BE THE WORD."

A QUESTION FOR LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES.—Punch suggests to the British Life Insurance Companies several questions, which, if they would make safe investments, they should add to their list of inquiries. Among them is the following:—

Do you know any Americans, and is there any chance of your getting into political or other argument with the owner of a revolver?

POLITICAL ABOLITIONISM.—Wm. A. H. under of Bryan county, O., has issued the first number of a paper under the above title. It is the advocate of Gerrit Smith's election, and of his class of Abolition views.

CHRISTOPHERS is the name which the Baptists and Campbellites of Kentucky propose to take, when the new translation of the Bible which they are making in common, and which regulates the term baptize, shall have been completed.

The Bible, according to these Kentucky Christians, is for the slavery they love and practice. Whether the new version makes the christian duty of slaveholding more clear and impressive, as well as the doctrine of Baptism we are not informed. It would hardly be up to the progressive spirit of the leader and oracle of that church unless it did.

THE EDITORS OF THE CAYUGA CHIEF, have removed their paper from Auburn, N. Y., to Wisconsin. On the 19th the friends of Temperance held a public meeting in Auburn, to bid adieu to the editorial family. The meeting is reported as one of much interest. The Chief is an excellent paper and speaks out plainly on the question Slavery, as well as Temperance to which it is especially devoted.

PASSENGERS PER U. S. R. R.—We find the following account in the Mahoning Register, of a company of Southern travellers who passed through Salem a few days since on a pleasure trip to the lakes:—

A hack-load of some nine stable individuals, driven by Gen. Gibbons, of Salem station passed through our place on Saturday last. Report says that six of the party were "chatties"—wearing of the luxuriant living—the indolent ease and balmy skies of their Southern home, seeking a change of air and scene in a Northern clime. Instead of passing by the usual route of the U. S. R. R. they were traveling along leisurely on the Plank Road, above ground—well armed—and prepared to give a warm reception to any blood-hound who might be dogging their tail.

SOMEWHAT EXCITED.—The Pennsylvania Relief Society's principal organ in Philadelphia relieves itself on Mr. Burlingame as follows:—

"In the name of God, in what times are we living, that this language of an empty, adulated, cracked brain bluster shall be uttered in the city of Philadelphia, amid the cheers and shouts of a large crowd, and then circulated among our voters by a leading commercial organ?"

REASONS WHY METHODISTS SHOULD NOT SUPPORT FILLMORE.

From the Liberator.

A former Know-nothing in New York, Chauncey Shaffer, Esq., who has gone over to Fremont, gives the following reasons why he, as a Methodist, should not support Fillmore. They are equally good for repudiating Buchanan.

"There are other objections to my supporting Mr. Fillmore, founded upon the fact stated by the Citizen, that I belong to the Methodist church.

The church owes slavery no particular good will, for slavery has rent that one for two; has imprisoned women for teaching the slave to read the Bible, and has sought in every way to destroy that church, as being the opponent of slavery most to be feared. Let facts speak. Last winter, a minister of the Methodist church, in Missouri, was arrested when in the pulpit by a gang of men, (who, if they live, will probably vote for Mr. Fillmore) who wantonly and falsely charged him with horse-stealing; and without allowing him time to put on his overcoat, mounted him on a horse, drove him some seventeen miles, (threw him into a cheerless room, without fire, there left him to die, and there he died.

My informant is a Bishop of the Methodist Church, and spoke of his own knowledge.

Another instance: The Rev. Mr. Wiley, and about thirty other ministers of the Methodist Church have been assailed in their churches and driven from place to place, like beasts of prey, their lives being every day in imminent peril.

Another instance: In Kansas, a Methodist minister was whipped, tarred and feathered, tied to a log and set adrift on the Missouri river.

Another instance: Very recently a Methodist minister in Missouri while preaching, was dragged from his pulpit and tarred and feathered; while an old Methodist layman, for the crime of expostulation against such conduct was shot; and it is a notorious fact, and one which will not admit of controversy, that a minister of my church cannot preach the Gospel in the State of Missouri, or the Territory of Kansas, but at the peril of his life; and yet I find no reproof of these outrages either in the Philadelphia platform or in any of the speeches of Mr. Fillmore.

Mr. Shaffer might have added, that he also finds no reproof of these outrages in the Methodist Church. The General Conference of that Church has met and separated since those outrages, without rebuking them or expressing sympathy with their mobbed brethren, and so far as we know, most, if not all the Annual Conferences have been equally silent. Is it less an outrage that ministers of religion should be dumb dogs in such a case, than that politicians should be? If Mr. Shaffer is justified by these reasons for becoming a comeouter from the Fillmore Party, he is culpable, for retaining his fellowship in the Methodist Church.

EDWARD C. DREYAN, in days past, a distinguished advocate of Temperance in New York is now receiving the applause of the Fillmore men of the South, for his avowed favor of their candidates.

For the Anti-Slavery Bugle.

T. W. HIGGINSON'S SPEECH.

DEAR BROTHER MARIUS—You probably will republish the very excellent speech of Mr. Higginson, made at Abington, Mass.—the 1st of August. It contains the following passage:—

"Take even this war in Kansas. The standard of Freedom in Kansas is not what we would have it; but take it as it is and show me a parallel to it in the history of the world! Compare it to the American Revolution. It was a tax on tea that drove our fathers to revolution—nothing more than that; but mark you! that tax upon tea was imposed upon themselves—they were to pay it. What tax has ever been imposed upon the people of Kansas? What have they been called upon to do that they did not want to do except this one solitary thing? They were called upon to do the very thing our fathers were willing to do—the thing that your John Michels fresh from the struggle for European freedom long to do—to hold slaves; and they would not consent to do it. It is a new thing in history; a revolution not to escape from being slaves but to escape from holding slaves. What is it—nothing else. The only foundation for this revolution in Kansas is that there men are unwilling to hold another slave in chains."

I wish for the honor of human nature that this representation of the Kansas affairs were true, but it contains so much of mistake that Abolitionists should take great pains to correct it. Nobody will pretend that any power could force the emigrants to Kansas to become slave-owners. If they shall ever stand in that relation to their fellow-men it will be a voluntary act. They are contending merely for the possession of the soil and for their own selfish purposes and are shrewd enough to perceive their own advantages in excluding the slave-owners from the territory. That this is the true reason for their opposition to the extension of slavery into the territory is very evident from the eagerness with which they are willing to assist the slaveholders upon other soil. It is manifest moreover in the fact that they have studiously sought to exclude the free-colored population from Kansas, a fact by the way which the Republicans endeavor to keep out of sight, as I have heard several of the most intelligent of my acquaintances among them almost deny, and affect to doubt it. It is simply absurd to claim for the Kansas emigrants that they are fighting to avoid becoming slave-owners. By the endeavor in their fundamental law to exclude colored emigrants they committed themselves to the doctrine that the stronger party may rightfully banish such would be residents as are obnoxious to them, and have no right to complain of the carrying out of their own principle. That their natural rights have been invaded and outraged is true and thus far they are entitled to our sympathy, but not to our respect as heroes battling for principle. In this respect they will not compare favorably with many who were engaged in the American Revolution. They fought to establish the right of a people to govern themselves. And on the score of outraged rights the four millions of our colored brethren have an immeasurably stronger claim upon us. I regret that this mistake has been fallen into by so glorious a champion of freedom as Mr. Higginson.

CHARLESTON, O., August 20. A. BROOKE.

THE SLAVEHOLDER'S POSTAGE BILL.—The New York Tribune says:—

"The reduction of postage was almost if not quite the first measure that was carried by the North against the South. The South generally opposed it, because it was mainly for the advantage of the Northern States, and of commerce, for which they have the hatred natural to semi-civilized communities. The Southern postage bills had always been fostered by the North, and the Slaveholders were afraid that the new experiment might ensure in some way to their detriment. Even the Empire of South Carolina, the land of Brooks and Bludgones, cannot pay its postage bill by a matter of \$70,000 or more. Not a single Slave State pays in postage what it costs to carry its mail matter, excepting Louisiana, and that is done by the Northern merchants established in New Orleans."

After thus speaking of Kansas and the slavery issue, Mr. Buchanan passed to our foreign policy. He approved in general terms of the Cincinnati resolutions on this subject. But said that while enforcing our own policy, we must at all times scrupulously regard the just rights and proper policy of other nations. He was not opposed to territorial extension. All our acquisitions had been fairly and honorably made. Our necessities might require us to make other acquisitions. He regarded the acquisition of Cuba as very desirable now, and it was likely to become a national necessity. Whenever we could obtain the island on fair honorable terms, he was for taking it. But he added, it would be a terrible necessity that would induce me to sanction any movement that would bring reproach upon us, or tarnish the honor and glory of our beloved country. After the formal interview was over Mr. Buchanan said playfully, but in the presence of the whole audience, "If I can be instrumental in getting the slave

MEETING AT DEER CREEK.

From the Bugle.

The Anti-Slavery meeting held August 17th, in the grove near Pierce's mill in Stark County, was numerously attended. It organized by the appointment of Abram Gaskill chairman, and A. Brooke Secretary. As there were no instructions to report the proceedings for any paper I shall offer but a brief and informal account of it to the Bugle. The speakers who successively occupied the attention of the audience were Wm. Holliday of Lima; Mr. Pryne of Ravenna, Edward Patterson of Alliance, Mr. Randall of New York, B. C. Gilbert of Atwater, Mr. Pryne in response to him and Wm. Myers, of New Lisbon. The principal topic of discussion was the principles of the Republican party and the pretensions of their candidates, which were criticized with apparent success, but with less than the severity of the whole truth, connected with the advocacy of Gerrit Smith's claims to the Presidency. The Disunion movement was also criticised with the usual misrepresentation of it as a no-government party, but as the discussion mainly took the shape of a conflict of opinion between those who propose to reform the people by the operations of the national Government, its friends were content to remain nearly silent. The expose made with great ability by Messrs. Randall and Pryne, of the pro-slavery influence and position of the Republican party, was listened to with deep attention and had its effect upon the minds of the listeners. The defence attempted for it only served to bring out more prominently its demerits. It is greatly to be regretted, the fine abilities and the undoubted moral stamina of those terming themselves Radical Abolitionists should lose so much of their efficiency by the delusive mist through which they view the Constitution of the United States. They equally with ourselves aim at Revolution, and they misrepresent us entirely, unless they willfully misrepresent us when they characterise us as a no government party. A. BROOKE.

SAMUEL MAY, JR., IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. May, the General Agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, is now on a lecturing tour in Eastern Pennsylvania. He writes to the Publishing agent of the Liberator, a somewhat encouraging account of his movements.

WESTGROVE, Chester Co., Pa., Aug. 15, 1856.

FRIEND WALCUT: I am moving about in this and Lancaster counties, fulfilling my appointments, and endeavoring to show to all, both Jews and Greeks, the 'more excellent way' of securing the triumph of freedom and the overthrow of slavery than by rushing into any political party, and withdrawing their energies from every other point, in order to concentrate all on the election of Col. Fremont. The Fremont enthusiasm is very great here, exceeding any thing I have seen in New England. I frankly admit to them, that all the political anti-slavery there is embodied in the Republican party; but I argue to them, that it is wholly inadequate to the purposes of Freedom, and to save us from the tails of the Slave Power. Some of the Fremont people are very earnest in laboring with me, to induce me to omit all discussion of the United States Constitution, and of Disunion, and Non-Voting. They speak at my meetings and they call on me in private. I remind them of their own motto, 'Free soil, free labor, free speech,' &c. Dr. Snodgrass was at one of my lectures, and made quite a clever speech, in answer to one of these Fremont objectors. For himself, he rejoiced (he said) that I had spoken as I had—hoped I should go on—wished that the agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society might go through the country—thought it was the time of all others for the Garrisonian doctrines to be proclaimed, &c. This, coupled with his announcement that he was in the county partly with the view of speaking for Fremont, took the others quite aback. I believe I shall be able to save some of the old non-voters on principle from backsliding into the half-way house of politics; and if I can influence any others to come up, even so far as to the Fremont standard, I shall not regret it. I set forth the No Union with Slaveholders in the clearest, strongest way I can. This Union must be dissolved.

Truly yours,

S. MAY, JR.

THE SERVILITY OF BUCHANAN.

The servility of Buchanan is set forth most effectively in the following letter from Senator Brown of Mississippi. Mr. Brown was chairman of the Committee, appointed by the Cincinnati Convention to inform Mr. Buchanan officially of his nomination.

WASHINGTON CITY, June 18.

My dear Sir: I congratulate you on the nomination of your favorite candidate for the Presidency. If the nomination of Mr. Buchanan was acceptable to me at first, it is still more so now—since I have seen him and heard him speak. The Committee, of which I was one, waited on him at his residence to give him formal and official notice of his nomination, and in the name of the National Democracy to request his acceptance of it. We found him open, frank, and wholly undisguised in the expression of his sentiments.

Mr. Buchanan was in the presence of all who had assembled, and they were from the North and the South, the East and the West, that he stood upon the Cincinnati platform, and endorsed every part of it. He was explicit in his remarks on its slavery features, saying that the slavery issue was the absorbing element in the canvass. He recognized to its fullest extent the overshadowing importance of that issue, and if elected, he would make it the great aim of his administration to settle the question upon such terms as should give peace and safety to the Union, and security to the South.

He spoke in terms of decided commendation of the Kansas bill, and as pointedly deprecated the unworthy efforts of sectional agitation to get up a national conflagration on that question. After the passage of the compromise measures of 1850, the Kansas bill was, he said, necessary to harmonize our legislation in reference to the Territory, and he expressed his surprise that there should appear anywhere an organized opposition to the Kansas bill, after the general acquiescence which the whole country had expressed in the measures of 1850.

After

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

News of the Week.

THE WAR IN KANSAS.

Kansas is now the seat of war, more bloody than at any previous time. The outrages of marauders who have infested the Territory committing theft, robbery, arson, rape and murder for the last few months have reached a length become intolerable. The Free State settlers, wearied with looking for aid from the North have taken redress into their own hands, and seem now ready to defend their rights and avenge their wrongs with their own weapons. Our friend C. S. Griffing who has just arrived from Leavenworth has brought us St. Louis papers from which we make selections.

The St. Louis Daily Democrat of the 21st contains the following editorial statement:

As we have given verbatim the printed accounts of disorder that have reached us from Kansas, and which proceed from the organs of the pro-slavery party, it is but fair that we should annex those which have reached us from the free State party through gentlemen who arrived in the city yesterday. One of these informs us that on August 9th a military camp, consisting of some 150 pro-slavery men were driven off from their position, four miles from Osawatomie. Our informant states that the plundering of provision wagons, proceeding from Kansas city to that point, had been traced to this camp, and hence the demonstration against it. He says that Franklin, near Lawrence, was a rendezvous for some sixty or seventy southern men, who committed trespasses upon the property of free State men, similar to that recorded above, and were besides, carrying on the stealing of horses. On the 12th these men were routed in an engagement, which resulted in the death of one free State man and the wounding of three. Seven pro-slavery men were wounded. William, a Missourian, who had expressed himself in favor of the Free State party, was shot by one McBride, a pro-slavery man, while the former was mauling rails. He died in a few hours after receiving the contents of the other's gun. This took place on the 10th inst.

Hoyt, a citizen of Lawrence, and peaceably inclined, while riding in the neighborhood of a camp of sixty southerners, on Washington creek, was taken from his horse, shot six times through the body, and left dead in the road. His horse was taken. The people of Lawrence called upon the United States to take action. As they declined, about two hundred of the Free State people marched on this camp, which retreated to Leavenworth. The Free State men receiving a reinforcement proceeded to Leavenworth on the morning of the 16th. From the numerous reports of artillery heard in that direction during that day, it is presumed that a sanguinary engagement must have been fought at that place. Particulars unknown.

On Sunday the 17th, Leavenworth city was alive with the preparations for another incursion into the territory. Despatches were being sent to Liberty, Platte City, Delaware, &c., with the offer of \$1,500 per day for men. The excitement was passing all bounds, and one thousand recruits were expected to arrive in the place by the morning of the 18th. Large numbers of the circular which we publish to-day had been distributed through the border counties and down the river as far as Brunswick. Laying parties had been organized at Independence, Weston, Lexington, and at other places. From the extensive preparations made, it was supposed that Lawrence would be reduced to ashes this evening. We give this on the authority of a gentleman who arrived in our city yesterday from the seat of war. His narrative is sad and indeed; well fitted to move the utmost solicitude of the true hearted and patriotic of our citizens.

Atchison, Springfield and others have issued an address to the people, calling the people to arms. The citizens of Lafayette county, Mo., held a public meeting and also issued an address, calling on the Missourians to come to the rescue of the pro-slavery men from the hands of the "abolitionists." The address closes as follows:

Now is the time for ACTION. We must have men to go into the Territory immediately or all will be lost. The intention of the Abolitionists is to drive us from Territory and carry the next election and get possession of the reins of government. This we must not submit to. If we do, Kansas is lost to the South forever—and our homes must be given up to the Abolition enemy.

Come then, to the rescue, O men of Lafayette! Meet at Lexington, on WEDNESDAY, at 12 o'clock, August 20th. BRING YOUR HORSES WITH YOU. YOUR GUNS AND YOUR CLOTHING are ready to go on. Let every man who can possibly leave home, go now to save the lives of our friends. Let those who cannot go, hitch up their wagons, and throw in a few provisions, and get more as they come along by their neighbors, and bring it Lexington on Wednesday. Let our children, your children, your friends, your homes—come up, and let us act in this matter decidedly, and put an end to Abolitionism in Kansas. Their motto is: No retrograde to slavery men.

Below is a specimen of the accounts of transactions we find them in the St. Louis Republican a border Ruffian Paper:

There is now no longer any doubt of a general war, waged upon us by the abolitionists. We must repel them—we must protect our men in Kansas! Come then, ye farmers of Lafayette! Old and young—and defend your friends, or you will soon be driven from your homes. Come up on Wednesday, ready to go on to Kansas, with horses, wagons, provisions and arms. Bring an extra horse if you have them.

From the Western Dispatch, Extra.

THE VERY LATEST.

UNITED STATES TROOPS WHIPPED.

From an extra of the Leavenworth Herald of last night, we have received confirmation of the worst fears. We have not time for comment but give the extract entire:

Col. Titus' Company held as Prisoners—Mr. Sheriff Jones' house threatened by the Outlaws—A Sheriff for Assistance—Murder and Butchery.

An express has just arrived here, bringing intelligence that Leavenworth has been taken by Lane's army, and that our friends are at the mercy of the armed ruffians. The attack was made this morning about the dawn of day. Our friends resisted as long as they could, but were finally overpowered by Lane's men, who numbered 800—all armed to the teeth.

They attacked the guard of U. S. troops, who had in charge Robinson and the other prisoners, who surrendered, not firing a gun, and are now in the hands of Lane's men. It is impossible to state in a letter all the outrages committed by these marauders.

The following dispatch, addressed to Col. Payne, of the 8th Regiment, tells a sad and dreadful tale. It is the man in Kansas that will not respond to the following earnest appeal! Let the cry of our friends be—To Arms!—To Arms!

NEAR LEAVENWORTH, AUGUST 16, 1856.

FRIENDS OF LAW AND ORDER, the abolitionists have come upon us this morning about daylight, whipped and taken prisoners our men. Leavenworth is taken, and deserted by the women and children. Lane's men are about 800 strong. The U. S. troops have also been whipped. Will you come out and rescue before we are all murdered? We are out of powder and lead and every kind of ammunition. Our friends are now stationed in Sheriff Jones' house, as many as can, and will fight to the last. Will you help us?—if so come at once. Unless we get help we will all be murdered. The foregoing is reliable.

D. R. ATCHISON,
W. H. RUSSELL,
JOS. C. ANDERSON.
A. G. BOON.

STILL LATER.—Monday morning 18th, 10 o'clock W. H. Russell, T. Hinch and Jos. C. Anderson, have just arrived from Kansas, to urge our citizens to go immediately to the rescue of our friends in Kansas. They confirm the above, and say that things are worse than represented, and that three hundred men must go up on Wednesday, August 20th.

KANSAS—LATEST.—News received since the above was in type informs us that the first accounts were greatly exaggerated. The Free State men had attacked and dispersed two camps of the marauders, but had not attacked Topeka, or released the prisoners. The Missourians are much excited and rallying to the aid of their alarmed comrades in the Territory.

THE FREMONT MEETING at Massillon, on Wednesday, is variously represented by its friends, as numbering from fifteen to forty thousand.

HO, FOR KANSAS!—Henry D. Clayton will start from Philadelphia on a circuit of emigrants on the 20th inst., and will be at Silver Run, Columbus, and Opelika on the 21st, and at West Point and Atlanta on the 22nd inst., and go on by the way of Nashville. Mr. Clayton is a reliable man, and all persons who wish to go to Kansas this fall ought to join him. He will pay their expenses from whatever point they join the expedition. Every settler is entitled to a pre-emption of 160 acres of land at 1.25 per acre.—Macon (Alabama) Republican.

FREEDOM OF OPINION has been mobbed down at Wheeling, Virginia. On Friday night last a meeting of the Fremont Association was being held at Melodion Hall, when it was admitted by the Wheeling Times, (a Fillmore organ), the friends of Fillmore and Buchanan came into the hall and disturbed, and finally dispersed the meeting by violence. One of the speakers, Dr. G. Price Smith, was pursued by the ruffian mob, with threats of tar and feathers &c., and finally, in self-defense, stabbed one of his assailants severely in the side, and cut the fingers of another. The Doctor was at length taken to jail "for safety," and gave bail the next day to answer the charge of stabbing. The Times says it is opposed to mob law, but thinks, evidently, that it was just about right to mob "the ruffian mob." We learn that the crowd, before proceeding to consider Republicanism, if the men thus trampled on do not now go on and establish their right to free speech, they will deserve to be mobbed. The stout mechanics of Wheeling cannot be mobbed into silence, if they choose to be free.—Pitts. Dispatch.

HANGING.—We learn from a gentleman recently from Fayetteville, that a large number of the citizens of Washington county, who resided in the neighborhood of Dr. Boone, who was murdered some time since by his negroes, headed by the doctor's sons, came to Fayetteville, on Monday last, took two of the negroes out of the jail and hung them. The negroes had been acquitted at a special term of the court held last week by Judge Barton, for the purpose of trying them. One of the three charged with the murder was convicted, and is now under sentence; the crowd did not molest him. We learn that the crowd, before proceeding to the jail, held a meeting at the court-house, and passed resolutions. There they were addressed by Judge Barton, Mr. Wilson and others, who endeavored to dissuade them from their purpose, but without effect.—Fort Smith (Arkansas) Herald.

A correspondent of the Spartanburg (S. C.) Express complains bitterly that the New York Observer has been stealing his thunder. He says he sent a communication to the Observer denouncing Senator Sumner in the characteristic style of South Carolina, and instead of publishing it as a rival without acknowledgment. He likes its "heavy blows at Mr. Sumner and all that kind of kin," but thinks he himself, who manufactured the thunder, has been treated shabbily.

The New York News, organ of Hard Buchanan, has an editorial disquisition to prove that Slavery is better than Freedom, for those who labor. It maintains that it on the whole better to be a slave than a free man at the South than white laborers at the North. The only circumstance in favor of free labor is stated as follows:

"Let us suppose he magnanimous to the North, and the white servant, and leads to many brilliant inventions, while plenty, and an absence of care, somewhat dulls the African race."

THE SHOW OF LIES.—Henry Ward Beecher says in the last Independent, very truly and eloquently:

"This campaign is to be one of eminent and abounding falsehood. It will rain and hail lies. They will come like gnats and locusts, like frogs and murmur."

There has been in use in Columbus, Ohio, for some weeks past a new wheeled phonon, which is of great admirability, and it is thought will introduce a new style of vehicles into use. It obviates the annoyances now experienced in getting into our modern four wheeled vehicles, and in turning them. The front wheel is so arranged as to run steadily, and there is less friction and consequently less resistance to draft.

HARTFORD, Aug. 21.

A VENERABLE TREE.—The venerable tree known as the Charter Oak, fell this morning with a tremendous crash. Crowds of citizens are now around it plucking memorials from this time honored relic.

A sectional caucus was held at Washington on Wednesday, by the Democrats, to take into consideration the course to be pursued with reference to the Army Bill. They decided to act upon nothing until the bill was disposed of, and not to adjourn until something was effected.

A correspondent of the Mobile Register, estimates the cotton crop of Alabama this year, will be one hundred thousand bales more than last year.

Ex-Governor Reeder, who is now lying sick at the Merchant's Hotel Philadelphia, and has had a severe attack of paralysis, which affects one side of his body.

Mr. Currie has been confirmed by the Senate as Governor of Oregon, together with several unimportant appointments.

The new Legislature of Iowa is reported:

Senate	Fremont	28
	Buchanan	28
House	Fremont	28
	Buchanan	24

NEGLECTED CORRESPONDENTS.—The Piedmont (Va.) Whig says, "Since the 25th of December 17 negroes have left the neighborhood of Middleburg, and not more than half have ever been heard from."

The Newark N. J. Mercury says, the results of the recent elections have changed a great many votes in that city.

Receipts for the Bugle for the week ending Aug. 27.

Edwin Garretson, New Lisbon,	\$1.50
Edwin Cook, Detroit,	3.00
George Deming, Centre Grove,	1.50
Alonzo Hasner, Parkman,	3.00
Isaac S. Gibson, Thompson's Station,	3.00
Robert C. Stewart, Fremont,	5.00
M. Rogers, Ann Arbor,	1.00
Total	15.00

ANNIVERSARY MEETING.

The fourteenth annual meeting of the Western Anti-Slavery Society will be held in Salem, Col. Co., Ohio, commencing on Saturday, the 30th of August, at 10 o'clock A. M., and continue three days.

There probably was never a time when the Anti-Slavery cause required of its friends a more stern and faithful advocacy, than the present. As their principles have been proclaimed amid scorn and contumely "without concealment," so should they be maintained amid the strife of political elements, and the allurements of party interest "without compromise."

While they may congratulate themselves upon the increasing favor with which their doctrines are received by the popular mind, they should not for a moment cease to inculcate the duty and necessity of demanding, not the restoration of a pro-slavery compromise of former days, not the mere limitation of chattelism to State boundaries, but that every friend of human rights should cease to support by speech or vote, by influence direct or indirect, the system of American Slavery.

The infamous slave law of 1850, the border foray upon Kansas, the recent cowardly and murderous attack in the Senate Chamber upon a member of the upper House, are but so many evidences of the utter hopelessness of abolitionists effectually laboring to promote the downfall of "the peculiar institution," until they practically adopt the motto of "No Union with Slaveholders."

All who hate slavery and seek its extinction, are invited to a solemn assembly for the purpose of counsel, and for aid.

It is expected that PARKER PILLSBURY will be present on the occasion and again greet his Western friends: CHARLES L. REMOND and A. T. FOSS, have also given us encouragement to hope they will be with us, as well as some others whom we cannot now announce.

On behalf of the W. A. S. Society:

BENJ. S. JONES, Recording Secretary.

ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

The Western Anti-Slavery Society, will hold its annual Fair in Salem, Dec. 24th and 25th.

The object of the fair is so well understood by the abolitionists of this country, that we deem it unnecessary to publish the time of its gathering, to secure the hearty and vigorous cooperation of a large circle of Anti-Slavery friends.

The past success of our efforts in raising means—and the faithfulness with which means have been applied to the enterprise of abolishing Slavery in America—warrant us to expect a willing response to this appeal, corresponding to the starting emergency of the time.

We have not now to meet and abolish Slavery on its original ground only, but in the new and beautiful Territory of Kansas—in Washington, in Ohio—and in all the Northern States where the servile minions of the South can give it a place.—We are not however disheartened or disappointed, and shall apply ourselves with unwearied diligence, trusting as ever in the stern principle of justice and right.

We hope that no time will be lost in making the necessary arrangements to meet this demand; and among other means, we suggest the importance of forming sewing circles as speedily as possible in every neighborhood where there is the scripture number of "two or three" women in whose hearts the love of Freedom burns to labor, so that the great demand for needle and knitting work, in its rich and useful varieties may be amply supplied.

The committee will gratefully receive in monies, produce, furniture, and all merchantable goods, whatever can be forwarded from this time till the Fair, thus affording an appropriate and varied series for the offering of each.

Emily Robinson, Joseph E. Griffing, J. Elizabeth Jones, Laura Barnaby, Angelina S. Deming, Elizabeth Leese, Ann Ransden, Lucy Ann Fawcett, Harriet Whitney, Jane M. Trevelick, Sarah Bown, Margaret Hise, Ellen E. Stewart, S. N. McMillan, Mary E. Norris, Hannah M. Straen, Sarah Sharp, Deborah G. Bonnell, Lydia S. Sharp, Hannah H. Bentley, Ann Pearson, Elizabeth W. Gordon.

The Scientific American.

TWELFTH YEAR!!!

ONE THOUSAND DOLLAR CASH PRIZES.

The Twelfth Annual Volume of this publication commences on the 13th day of September. The "SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN" is an ILLUSTRATED PERIODICAL, devoted chiefly to the promulgation of information relating to the various Mechanic and Chemical Arts, Industrial Manufactures, Agriculture, Patents, Inventions, Engineering, Millwork, and all interests which the light of PRACTICAL SCIENCE is calculated to advance.

Reports of U. S. PATENTS granted are also published every week, including OFFICIAL COPIES of all the PATENT CLAIMS, together with news and information upon THOUSANDS OF OTHER SUBJECTS.

\$1000—IN CASH PRIZES—will be paid on the 1st of January next, for the largest list of subscribers, as follows:—\$200 for the 1st, \$175 for the 2nd, \$150 for the 3d, \$125 for the 4th, \$100 for the 5th, \$75 for the 6th, \$50 for the 7th, \$25 for the 8th, \$20 for the 9th, \$15 for the 10th, \$10 for the 11th, and \$10 for the 12th. For all Clubs of 20 and upwards, the subscription price is only \$1.40. Names can be sent from any Post Office until January 1st, 1857.

Here are fine chances to secure cash prizes. The SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN is published once a week; every number contains eight large quarto pages, forming annually a complete and splendid volume, illustrated with SEVERAL HUNDRED ORIGINAL ENGRAVINGS.

TERMS.—Single Subscriptions, \$2 a year, or \$1 for six months. Five copies sent gratis, \$4 for a year. Specimen copies sent gratis. Southern, Western and Canada money, or Post Office Stamps, taken at par for subscriptions. Letters should be directed (post paid) to MUNN & CO.

125 Fulton St., New York.

Messrs. MUNN & CO., are extensively engaged in procuring patents, for new inventions, and will advise inventors, without charge, in regard to the novelty of their improvements.

ORTHO YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS OF HUMAN PROGRESS.

All Persons, without regard to sect, sex, color, condition or opinion, who are desirous of participating with the Ohio Yearly Meeting of Friends of Human Progress, in their efforts to elevate the social, moral or religious condition of mankind, are invited to meet together at Salem, Col. Co., Ohio, Saturday the 6th day of September, 1856, at 10 o'clock A. M. The meeting will probably continue for three days.

In again convening this annual assembly of free spirits who dare to engage in promoting truth and meeting the wants of this age, without falling back upon the old landmarks of authoritative assumptions, the Committee feel assured that the coming Meeting will not fall behind any of its predecessors in interest, but that the fountains of fresh thought, and fresh interest, will be sustained by the increasing interest manifested in free associations, where all questions pertaining to man's best interest can be fairly and thoroughly canvassed.

Isaac Trescott, Abraham Brooks, Caroline Stanton, Benj. S. Jones, Esther Harris, James Barnaby.

HANDSOME BUILDING.

SITES IN SALEM, OHIO.

I am now prepared to sell three DESIRABLE LOTS, on Lisbon Street, opposite the dwellings of Messrs. Wright, Jones, Hillman, &c., &c. Enquire of John Fleming, or the subscriber.

BENJAMIN BOWN.

I offer, also, for sale the Farm where I now reside; being 130 Acres, well improved, well watered and in good condition, 2 1/2 miles South of Salem, on the Lisbon Road.

Aug. 23, 1856. BENJAMIN BOWN.

NEW ARRANGEMENTS.

The Subscriber having purchased the Stock in Trade of Mr. Samuel Grove, Corner of Main and Elmworth Streets would respectfully invite the attention of the citizens of Salem and of the surrounding country to his stock of Groceries and provisions.

Flour, Salt, &c., &c.

NO CHARGE FOR SHOWING GOODS.

All articles sold warranted to be as good as recommended. My purchases being all made with cash, I flatter myself that I can give entire satisfaction to all who may favor me with a call.

CASH PAID FOR EGGS.

Remember the Corner, Groves old stand.

LYMAN BROOKS, Agent.

I have on hand and for sale Doctor Webster's Invigorating Cordial or Health Bitter, a sure remedy for Jaundice, Liver Complaint, Dyspepsia, &c., and a great regulator of the Stomach and Bowels. Also, Brooks' sure remedy for Rheumatism and Dysentery and Cholera morbus.

Warranted to Cure in all Cases of the money will be refunded.

Price 50 cents a bottle.

SALEM, Ohio, Aug. 2, 1856.

LYMAN BROOKS.

COL. FREMONT'S LIFE.

THE ONLY COMPLETE AND AUTHORIZED EDITION.

THE LIFE AND PUBLIC SERVICES OF JOHN CHARLES FREMONT.

WITH AN ACCURATE PORTRAIT BY STEEL.

One neat 12mo. Price \$1.

By John Bigelow, Esq., Editor N. Y. Evening Post.

The subscribers assure the public that this volume, prepared by a gentleman, whose resources for the material and authorities are direct, will be the only complete biography of the eminent explorer, scholar, statesman, and hero, whose recent nomination by the Republican party, for the highest office in the gift of the people, had awakened a renewed interest in his wonderful career. Much material heretofore inaccessible to the general reader, including incidents in his early career, is incorporated in this volume.

Orders should be addressed to

PERDUE & JACKSON, Publishers, No. 119 Nassau-st., New York.

Agents wanted in every town of the several States to canvass for the above work.

Copies sent by mail postpaid on receipt of price.

K. G. THOMAS, M. D. J. C. WHINERY, D. D. S.

THOMAS & WHINERY,

(SUCCESSORS TO D. C. SWAIN.)

Wholesale, Retail and Prescription Druggists

MAIN-STREET, SALEM, O.

Keep constantly on hand and for sale a general assortment and carefully selected stock of MEDICINES, Drugs, PAINTS, OILS, Dry-stuffs, Varnish, Perfumery, Fancy soaps, Brushes, WINDOW GLASS, Vials, Physicians' Shop trunks, &c.

SURGICAL INSTRUMENTS AND DENTAL STORE.

Special care directed to the selection of TEETH and compounding PRESCRIPTIONS.

They are also agents for the sale of Dr. Daniels' Trusses, Abdominal, Shoulder and other Braces, Artificial Limbs, Fracture and other Bandages. SALEM, July 19, 1856.

K. G. THOMAS, M. D. & ELIZA L. S. THOMAS, M. D.

Surgeons, Physicians and Obstetricians.

Have recently located themselves in Salem to attend to calls in their profession.

Office over Thomas & Whinery's Drug Store.

They are prepared to teach students as heretofore, though with increased facilities. The Studio is importer of Papier Mache Models, and have a variety of Skeletons, Models, &c., &c., for sale. SALEM, June 19, 1856.

FARQUHAR HOUSE.

BY FRANKLIN HILLMAN.

EAST END OF MAIN-ST., SALEM, OHIO.

This well-known stand having been purchased within the last few days by FRANKLIN HILLMAN, who intends keeping it strictly a

TEMPERANCE HOUSE.

will be found by the travelling community to possess all the facilities and advantages of the best conducted Hotels. The House is to be thoroughly fitted up, and furnished in the most approved modern style, for the accommodation of guests. It is the determination of the Proprietor that none who may favor him with their patronage shall have reason to complain in any particular or go away dissatisfied. Bills moderate.

July 28, '56

J. C. WHINERY D. D. S.,

SOUTH SIDE OF MAIN STREET, SALEM, O.

Continues to give close attention to all the changes and improvements in the practice of Dentistry and is still operating extensively and satisfactorily in all branches of his Profession.

His uniform success, even in the most difficult operations, has been such heretofore as to warrant the assurance that full satisfaction will be given to those who may avail themselves of his services. He has procured the right of Dr. A. B. Stanton to use his preparation of colored Gold Filling when desired as a base for artificial teeth.

All operations warranted. SALEM, June 7, 1856.—

THE ANTISLAVERY BUGLE.

Miscellaneous.

SLAVERY AND SERFDOM IN RUSSIA.

Translated from the Russian. From the N. Y. Rev. Post.

Serfdom began to be general in Russia only when it had begun to decline in the rest of Europe. There had always been serfs (*cholopi*) who were sold. These were the descendants of persons, who had been made prisoners of war, from the time of the domination of the Mongols. They were put to all kinds of labor, and were bought and sold. But the native peasantry (*Krestianin*) from time immemorial had been free men, and as Karamzin asserts, in the full enjoyment of civil liberty, but without individual possession of land, personal property or inheritable real estate. The land was owned, not by the individuals, but by the whole community. It is true that the soil of the parish, or community, appropriated it for its own purposes, paying to the lord thereof, only a tribute in money and labor, the amount of which was every year determined by mutual agreement or contract. The lands belonging exclusively to the lord were cultivated by his own slave—the house or court menials.

This constitution of a parish or community was *de facto* a republic, each member of which had an equal share in the common wealth of the parish. The prairies and arable lands were divided equally among the tillers of the soil, and the inequality of fortunes was prevented by the prohibition of inheritance. Wood and water, hunting and fishing grounds were left undivided, but their use was not controlled by the will of a single man, but by the time to time they were subjected to equal division, as the wants of the community required. The administration of government was patriarchal, like that of a family. The magistrate, who was at the head of the community, was called "father," and he shared the administration of affairs with a council styled the "Ancients." The exercise of his authority the "father" held great power over individuals, but none over the community. His authority was constantly limited and restrained by the "Ancients," whose votes controlled all his public acts; but the supreme power was vested in the community. The division of lands and the assessment of taxes were decided in public meetings, which also checked the excesses of the magistrate, and in extreme cases even obtained his deposition. In these meetings every tax-payer was entitled to vote.

This liberal constitution existed both before and after the domination of the Tartars, but under the rule of the Czar its provisions of liberality towards the peasants were gradually diminished, and at last, totally annihilated. This was the beginning of the enslavement of the masses, and it led to successive aggressions, ending in the complete usurpation of the soil by the wealthy nobles. Russian serfdom, as it now exists, was first established at the close of the sixteenth century. Shortly before, an outbreak of revolutionary anarchy induced the Czar, Boris Godunov, to promulgate an ukase, prohibiting the free transit of the peasants from one community to another. This free migration of the peasants diminished the income of the lower nobility of the empire, who could not offer the same inducements to the peasants, as the greater lords—the princes, boyars and clergy—and as the power of the crown lay principally in the services of these small landowners, the Czar was interested to prevent their impoverishment. A ukase, dated in the year 1593, took from the peasants, who were at this period under contract, the right of migration, and required them to remain on those lands where their contracts were registered on the last St. George's day. This ukase was undisturbed and unopposed. The peasantry thereupon became fixtures of the soil, the property of the lord, and consequently inheritable. Such was the original establishment of serfdom in Russia.

The first consequence of this act of piracy was an attempt, on the part of the nobles, to evade the ukase. Those who had from their own free will made engagements for a certain length of time, endeavored, after the expiration of their contract, by the payment of the contract loan, to free themselves. In order to put a stop to the quarrels and litigation to which these efforts gave rise, another ukase was promulgated, in the year 1597, which prohibited the repayment, by the peasants of any money for the purpose of freeing themselves, and directing all peasants who had served without a written contract, to sell themselves to those lords whom they had served, for the period of six months. Those only who had served for a shorter period were permitted to choose their own masters. These arbitrary measures so exasperated the peasants that they broke out in open revolt which could only be suppressed by armed intervention. Thus were the peasants of Russia despoiled of their liberty.

St. George's Day has ever since that time been regarded as an unlucky day—a day of public calamity—by the Russian peasantry, and to this day in the melancholy strains of many Russian songs, the "Jurists" day is referred to as that disastrous day when liberty was taken from them, and they were all made unhappy slaves. The sudden restriction upon the freedom of migration was found, in an economical point of view, to injure the very class it was intended to benefit. Scarcity of labor in some localities, and superabundance in others, were natural results. To remedy these evils, a ukase was promulgated in 1604, so modifying its predecessors as to permit the serfs of small landowners to change their places of residence under certain restrictions. The institution of soil serfdom naturally enough effected a complete social revolution, but, strictly considered, it was as yet only a *de facto* serfdom. Peter the Great completed the iniquity. Until his time the lord exercised a property power over only his house menials; but now the peasants were reduced to the same grade with the menials. Previously the peasants could not be separated from the soil, nor driven into exile, but now they were placed under the absolute control of their masters, and their persons were declared to be saleable property.

By this act Peter the Great not only destroyed the power of the nobility and clergy, but annihilated the last shadow of freedom which had remained to the peasantry. Having robbed the peasantry of their political power, he sought to indemnify them by giving the peasantry absolutely into their power. In carrying out his views, with unheard of cruelty, he displaced the inhabitants of whole villages and compelled them to embrace new occupations. Some communities he gave in whole to foreign nobles, and obliged them to labor in factories. The nobility followed the example of their Imperial master, and, considering the persons of their serfs as valuable merchandise, hired them for stipulated sums and certain periods for foreign plantations, and in this manner the system of hiring (*chok*) was developed.

That the free community institutions of the peasantry should be shattered by this system of hiring follows as a matter of course; and during the eighteenth century the fruits of their overthrow became apparent. The national industry was demoralized, agriculture was despoiled by the peasants as degraded, and was consequently neglected. Since the peasants had been reduced from free men to the condition of slaves, the rivalries of industry were no longer attractive; a degree of stolidity manifested itself, and in order to forget the gloomy past and the hopeless future they resorted to the monetary consolation of intoxicating liquors. Drunkenness became a national characteristic, and under its influence, the morals of the nation rapidly degenerated. A further evil of the hiring system was, that it awakened in the nation a desire for a nomadic life—for trading and wandering. In many cases, serfs thus hired out returned comparatively wealthy to their places of birth. The primitive simplicity of this hospitable people was thus destroyed, and envy, with a host of kindred bad passions, corrupted their hearts, and made them discontented with their lot.

It must be confessed that their situation was indeed horrible. Russian serfdom is worse than slavery in America, and might well require the pen of a Beecher Stowe to delineate it truthfully. The peasant was not only separated from the soil during his natural life, but was prohibited from ever changing his residence, his occupation, or his master. He was entirely at his master's pleasure, and might be torn from home and family, transported to distant regions, and perhaps sold to a worse master. Tyranny and persecution were the lot of the serf, and the extinguish the last spark of kindly sympathy. The reform of the army, which

made the nobility responsible for a certain number of soldiers, influenced in a great measure the cruelties perpetrated by the nobles against the poor serf, while nothing was done to alleviate his physical or mental wrongs. In him the right of a living soul was not recognized. All the aspirations of his soul were crushed down; he was even not permitted to feel as a man, or as a citizen, as a father, or as a child; he was estimated and dandled precisely as a chattel—an anvil or hammer—as a lifeless log, or insensible tool. At the present time a serf is valued at ten roubles per annum, though he has been reared from thirty to forty roubles for his master.

In some parts of Russia serfdom was introduced at a later period, as in Lesser Russia, where the Empress Elizabeth, to gratify the rapacity of her favorite Rasumowski, presented to him 50,000 free peasants, reducing them at once, by a despotic ukase, to mere serfs. Other parts annexed by conquest to the empire at a still later period, like Finland, were permitted to retain their national institutions, and serfdom was therefore not introduced, because it never existed in this country—the inhabitants of Finland, called *Odnovozres*, were free and independent peasants, acknowledging no masters, and paying only a certain amount of taxes and labor to the crown. They were the descendants of nobles, who, for some offence, were exiled to these distant regions by Peter and his predecessors, and being stripped of all other privileges, retained only that of freedom of the body. Though they in all other respects, in the lapse of time degenerated to the condition of the serfs of Russia, they yet retained a certain pride of their freedom, and regarded a marriage with a serf as an unpardonable *meanness*. A further check to serfdom was offered in the army system, which excluded another aristocracy in the lower classes, because all men who had served in the army became free men.

But these small impediments did not diminish the miseries of serfdom in Russia, they were merely exceptions to the rule, and a more severe blow was needed to effect seriously the system of Peter the Great. This blow was at last struck by Alexander I, whose liberal tendencies induced him to promote the emancipation of the serfs. He contemplated a general and sudden abolition of slavery, believing that this measure would advance the social well-being and security of the empire. Alexander deserves credit for his sentiments of humanity, as his letter to a magnate of his empire will show. A nobleman having, in a letter, rendered, solicited the donation of a large estate he replied as follows: "The peasants of Russia are already nearly all slaves, and I will not be an instrument for the further degradation and misery growing out of such an institution. I, therefore, will not see their numbers increased, and I have made it my rule not to give any more peasants as property; the estate shall be given to you, but under the express condition, that the peasants shall not be sold like cattle."

Alexander soon discovered the necessity of abandoning the idea of sudden emancipation and adopting the slow method of successive reforms. A ukase first appeared forbidding the selling of serfs, without the soil, and with this measure soil serfdom was reestablished. The next step was the ukase of February 20th, 1803, creating a class of free peasants. This law had the following provisions:

1. That all free men might acquire and hold real estate, wherever they pleased; until this period they could only be officials, or merchants of a city.

2. That all those liberated peasants, who had received, under certain conditions, land from their lords, should have power to convey, bequeath, or transmit such lands.

Alexander next ameliorated the condition of the crown serfs, fearing to endanger the nobility, by a sudden liberation. He fixed their taxes and socalled, and reconstituted their primitive communal institutions. That these privileges of the crown serfs emboldened the private serfs against their masters, who were opposed to such humane and lenient measures, will readily be imagined. The idea of emancipation was, for this reason abandoned by the Emperor during his war with Napoleon I. At the conclusion of the war, however, Alexander renewed his philanthropic phantasies. The nobility of the Baltic provinces seemed to sympathize with the Emperor, and he tried a noble experiment, which proved successful. A ukase from the 16th of May, 1816, abolished serfdom in Rithland, and a year later a ukase from the 25th of August, 1817, emancipated the serfs of the island. The nobility of Livland presented a petition to the Emperor, in March, 1819, praying for similar action, which was immediately sanctioned, and thenceforth all the peasantry of the Baltic provinces became free men, though without the power to hold real estate.

These experiments created a greater sensation in the empire than the Emperor had anticipated. The nobility opposed every measure towards the emancipation of their serfs, and even menaced the Emperor with revolt. Here unfortunately, the courageous perseverance of the Emperor failed, and only single instances of emancipation on the part of the nobles were afterwards proclaimed. The peasants, seeing their hopes of freedom thus vanished away, towards the close of the year 1824, broke out in open revolt in several provinces. The Dowager-Empress, then travelling in the Province of Novgorod, was forcibly retained by the peasants to remedy these evils, and presented to her the alleviation of "their crushing burdens." The Emperor, intimidated, referred them to the Emperor, who was following his mother. As soon as the Emperor approached, the peasants knelt before his horses and carriage, and thus forced Alexander to hear their petition. This auditory excited the wrath of the Emperor, and, with angry words he handed the paper back to the peasants. He told them, however, that he would reflect on their petition; but never returned an answer. This treatment from the Czar excited the peasants to revolt, and the revolt was put down by the nobles then became more tyrannical than ever. Hundreds of serfs were sent to the mines of Siberia by their masters for trivial or imaginary offences, and generally such persons were selected who, either from age or sickness, had become unable to work. They were torn from their families, banished as criminals to Siberia, or died under the application of the knout. The cruelties of the nobility hardly knew bounds, and at last called imperatively for reform.

Nicholas, as soon as he was seated firmly on the throne, began to devise measures of redress. Daily the Emperor received thousands of petitions from the serfs, begging for relief. This called forth the ukase of May 18th, 1826, which said: "The Emperor, being aware that certain rumors have been spread by malicious persons, calculated abominably to deceive the simple minds of the peasants for purposes of personal advantage, commands hereby, that no such rumors should be spread, and that no peasant pay without murmur his taxes and render their lawful labor." In the meantime Nicholas instructed the nobility "not to treat their serfs as property, but as men, and not to treat them with too much rigor." But these measures were found insignificant. The badly paid authority could easily be bribed by the nobles, and in 1827 a ukase ordered that the authority of the legal magistrates should no longer suffice to transport a criminal to Siberia, but that the permission of the Governor-General should first be obtained; also, that this punishment should not be inflicted upon persons over fifty years of age, and in no case should a father be separated from his children under five years of age. This law rendered abuses less frequent, but the work of emancipation had hardly progressed. Of nearly 45,000,000 of serfs, only 24,344 had been freed in the space of six years from 1824 until 1830.

At last Nicholas issued a ukase, declaring the crown serfs "free men." The number of serfs was by this one act diminished forty per cent. The Czar then turned his attention to the purchase of private estates annexing them to those of the crown, and thus freeing the serfs. Nearly half of Great Russia came in this manner into the possession of the crown. In consequence of this large increase of the crown estates, a separate ministry was, in January, 1838, instituted for their government, independent of the Ministry of Finance, which had previously controlled them. Since that time the condition of the peasantry has been dependent upon the will of this ministry; and though they are called "free men," yet they are forbidden to change their residence or their occupation without special permission from the Ministry of Finance, and are wronged and plundered by the Government officials.

Nevertheless, the crown peasants, to a certain extent, govern themselves. In each department, at the time of the elections of the nobles, they send two delegates to the "Tribunal of Peasants." One of these delegates is, at the same time, a member of the college of "Public Charity." They also elect a "Zemski," or overseer of the local police. These three in every district or department, and for each five hundred house or land-owners a delegate is sent. The elections must be men of family, at least thirty years of age, and of a respectable character. The elections require to be confirmed by the governors of the respective provinces. In every community are also elected local officers, as the *Selski*, for five years, and the *Dasitski* every month. Besides, in every village of ten houses officials are chosen who bear the titles of Ancients of the village, mayors, tax-collector, inspectors of the flour Magazines, wood procurers, justices of the peace, fire wardens, &c. All candidates for these offices must be at least twenty-five years of age, and all discharged soldiers are eligible.

In Siberia the election of the crown peasants takes place every year, through delegates, one for each hundred. The offices in the gift of the peasants are here confined to four districts only: a Mayor, Warden and Secretary, and for each of the villages the Ancients and *Dasitski*. The peasants of Siberia, as well as of the Caucasus, do not send delegates to the tribunals, the Crown reserving the privilege of appointing them.

All these changes have modified, in a great measure, those primitive institutions which Alexander I desired to see re-established, and particularly the introduction of military colonies proposed by Count Arakchiesch. But we must at the same time confess, that the condition of the Crown peasants is daily more comfortable, as the nobles have aroused the envy and animosity of the private serfs towards their masters. In 1840 there remained 300,000 of private serfs and 20,000 of Crown peasants. That something must be done to redress the wrongs of these private serfs, Nicholas well knew, yet he still delayed action, until he was forced to do so by the Emperor. He issued his ukase authorizing the nobility to emancipate their serfs in any way agreeable to both parties.

The ministerial rescript to the different chiefs of departments read as follows:

"You receive herewith the ukase of the second of April, with the conditions which permit the nobility to conclude contracts for the emancipation of their serfs at their own discretion. The ukase is *de facto* entirely new, and it adds only a few rules to the prescriptions of 1803. It is not, therefore, necessary to give a new interpretation to this ukase. His Majesty the Emperor has ordered me to communicate this will to the military and civil governors, and to command them to take the necessary precautions that no false rumors may be circulated regarding the so-called freedom of the peasants; secondly, to direct their attention to the careful surveillance of the peasants, that they may be obedient to the lawful authority of their masters."

The effects of this ukase could be easily predicted. The nobility opposed to emancipation declined to make any engagements with their serfs on the ground that a serf was merely a piece of merchandise, with which negotiation was impossible.

The emancipation of these unfortunate people was, therefore, again postponed to an indefinite period. Several revolts in all parts of the empire were the natural consequence, unheeded of the nobles, who were not prepared to acknowledge the murder of from sixty to seventy nobles, who had been slain by their serfs. Even in the Baltic Provinces, where the peasants had been freed, but without the privilege of possessing the land they occupied, great excesses were committed. The private serfs, who were the victims of the nobles, declared openly that "the Emperor need only give permission to the peasants to kill the nobles, and to-morrow we should all be slain on our manors." The 12th of June, 1844, saw another ukase, which made a distinction between the house menials and peasants, and held the government officials responsible for the better treatment of the latter. The census of the year 1844, showed that there were yet over 30,000 of peasants held in bondage by 109,340 nobles though very unequally divided. Of these 30,000, 600 of serfs of 10,704,378 were taxed, belonging to about 88,000 nobles who possessed from one to ten serfs each. There were 15,712 nobles, who held from 10 to 200, 3,791 had more than 500, and five nobles owned 5,000 or more.

The following years, 1845 and 1846, were equally happy in adding to the measures for the amelioration of the serfs, but which were rendered ineffectual by the death of the Emperor. The ukase of the 20th of November, 1847, to inaugurate the most important measure in favor of the peasantry, and the consequent overthrow of the tyranny of the nobility. This ukase decreed that communities advertised for public sale, on account of their masters' debts, should be sold to the peasants for themselves and their heirs. That such cases occurred only when communities were nearly beggared by their masters need not be stated; but notwithstanding all obstacles, the results of this ukase were most astonishing. Wherever such a sale took place, the peasants, who were hitherto a wretched and ignorant people, were sold, the wealthier ones lent them the money to purchase their independence.

That the Emperor Nicholas had the tact to choose the right moment for the inauguration of a great measure, nobody acquainted with his character will deny. Scarcely had the noise of the French Revolution reached the ears of the Emperor, when a new ukase appeared, dated March 15th, 1848, granting to the serfs individually the right to acquire real estate. The Muscovite press, and even that of Western Europe, applauded this ukase as a step leading directly to the complete emancipation of the peasant. But though it granted to the peasants the power to hold real estate, it provided expressly that it should only be by the special permission of the lord, and without the right to hold real estate.

It affords a deep and interesting study for the politician to trace out, step by step, the manifold findings of the nobles, who were so anxious to proclaim a ukase granting a few privileges to serfdom, and again another appears designed to appease the jealousy of the rapacious nobles; and still through all, by slow yet sure gradations, the manifest destiny of the institution of the peasant is indicated. The nobles, who were hitherto a wretched and ignorant people, were sold, the wealthier ones lent them the money to purchase their independence.

The year 1854 saw the birth of another ukase, which forbade the lease of all estates to which the nobles had no title. This law evidently intended to compel the proprietors to sell their estates in cases where they would prefer to lease them, and to offer to the communities, or single individuals, opportunities to gain their freedom. But it is clear that this ukase was by no means the last step towards serf emancipation, and that the liberty of the peasantry is yet in its infancy. Runaway serfs, though they may have been fugitives more than ten years, must still be delivered up to their masters. If a serf is killed without premeditation the murderer is only required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements, and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avowed masters respect the personal property of the serf. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight franks as a rent for each serf. If a serf is killed by a noble, he is required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account